SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

#### CIVIL COVER SHEET

The 3S 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	-21110-10110-1011									
L (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
CHAUNCEY MORSE				NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff				County of Residence of First Listed Defendant						
., , , ,	me, Address, Telephone Nu	mber and Email Add	iress)		AND CON		ATION CASES, US	E THE LOCATI	ON OF TH	IE
Tara L. Patterson, Esc				DA:	ND INVOL	VEO.				
Kimmel & Silverman, I 30 E. Butler Pike	P.C.		į	Attemeys (If Known)	)					
Ambler, PA 19002			l							
(215) 540-8888										
II. BASIS OF JURISD	OICTION (Place an "X" in	One Box Only)		TIZENSHIP O	F PRIN	CIPA	L PARTIES	Place an "X" in (	One Box fo	r Plaintiff
	-			For Diversity Cases On	ıly)		,	and One Box I	or Defenda	att)
D 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	3 Federal Question (U.S. Government N	ot a Party)	Citizer	of This State	PTF O I	DEF O 1	Incorporated or Pri of Business In This		PTF 3 4	DEF □ 4
© 2 U.S. Government	Ø 4 Diversity		Citizer	of Another State	Ø 2	(J 2	Incorporated and P		D 5	O 5
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship	of Parties in Item III)					of Business In A	Another State		
				i or Subject of a eign Country	<b>5</b> 3	<b>D</b> 3	Foreign Nation		96	<b>7</b> 6
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Onl		ones ael escentate	RFEITURE/PENAL/I	TO E AND I SHAWAR	- SAMPAGE	KRUPTCY	To the constraint	CONT. APPRESE	ere.
CONTRACT  110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJUR		Agriculture			al 28 USC 158	☐ 400 State R	STATUT	
120 Marine		362 Personal Injury		Other Food & Drug		23 With		(J 410 Antitru		man
O 130 Miller Act	☐ 315 Airplane Product	Med. Malpraetic		Drug Related Seizure		28 U	SC 157	430 Banks		g
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment		<ul> <li>365 Personal Injury - Product Liability</li> </ul>		of Property 21 USC 8: Liquor Laws		ROPEI	RTYSRIGHTS	☐ 450 Commi ☐ 460 Depon		
& Enforcement of Judgment	Slander t	368 Asbestos Persona	al (3 640	R,R, & Truck	(7) 8:	20 Сору	rights	3 470 Racket	çer Influenc	
☐ 151 Medicate Act ☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 330 Federal Employers' Liability	Injury Product Liability		) Airline Regs. ) Occupational		30 Paten 40 Trade		Corrup 28 480 Consui	t Organizati ner Credit	2001
Student Loans	☐ 340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPER	RTY	Safety/Health				490 Cable/!	Sat TV	
(Excl. Veterans)  153 Recovery of Overpayment	***	<ul> <li>370 Other Fraud</li> <li>371 Truth in Lending</li> </ul>	. D 690	Other LABOR	asses issas	OCIAL	SECURITY	☐ 810 Selecti ☐ 850 Securit		ulities/
of Veteran's Benefits	🗇 350 Motor Vehicle (	380 Other Personal	C) 710	Fair Lahor Standards	O 84	61 HIA	(1395ff)	Exchan	gt	
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits ☐ 190 Other Contract	☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	Property Damage  ☐ 385 Property Damage		- Act   Labor/Mgmt, Relation			k Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 875 Custon 12 USC		ge
195 Contract Product Liability	☐ 360 Other Personal	Product Liability		Labor/Mgmt.Reportin	ng 🗇 81	64 S\$IĐ	Title XVI	□ 890 Other \$	Statutory Ac	ctions
☐ 196 Franchise  REAL PROPERTY	lojury CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETITIO	NS 740	& Disclosure Act Railway Labor Act			(405(g)) VETAX SUITS	☐ 891 Agricu ☐ 892 Econor		ration Act
210 Land Condemnation		J 510 Motions to Vaca		Other Labor Litigation			s (U.S. Plaintiff	[7] 893 Enviro		
220 Foreclosure	O 442 Employment O 443 Housing/	Sentence	C 791	Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	ا ا		efendant)	S 894 Energy B 895 Freedo		
☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment ☐ 240 Torts to Land		Habeas Corpus:		Security Act	η,		Third Party SC 7609	Act	ai or intent	пиноп
245 Tort Product Liability		<ul> <li>535 Death Penalty</li> <li>540 Mandamus &amp; Ot</li> </ul>		IMMIGRATION	3073E			☐ 900Appeal	of Fee Dete Equal Acce	
290 All Other Real Property		🗇 540 Mandamus & Ot 🗇 550 Civil Rights		! Naturalization Applic I Habeas Corpus -	anon			to Justi		:55
		555 Prison Condition		Alien Detaince				950 Constit		aſ
	Other  440 Other Civil Rights		1,7 40	Other Immigration Actions				State S	attics	
521 Original		temanded from [	☐ 4 Rein: Reop	energ (1) 3	ransferred nother dist		ロ 6 Multidistr Litigation	niet 🗇 7	Appeal to Judge froi Magistrate	m e
<u> </u>	Citis the U.S. Civil State	uto pridet which you a	-	13	specify) tional sta	tutes u			Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Fair Debt Collec	ise: tion Practices A	\ct							
VII. REQUESTED IN			N DI	EMAND S			HECK YES only			nt:
COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P.	23				J	URY DEMAND:	: <b>2</b> √Yes	O No	
VIII. RELATED CAS	(See instructional)	JUDGE			Ľ	OCKE	ET NUMBER			
Explanation:		<del></del>		_			_			
11 1		. In	4	1 Due La	A					
4/29/11		Ull	MM	CHUTH	$\omega \omega$					
DATE		SIGNATURE C	OF ATTOR	NEY OF RECOR	D					

### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA DESIGNATION FORM to be assignment to appropriate calendar.	used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 9704 Glendale Road, Pittsh	rg, PA, 15235
Address of Defendant: 507 Prodential Road, Harshar	n, PA 19044
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	•
(Use Reverse Side For Ac	lditional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation and	
(Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1(a))	Yes□ No□
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yeso No
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Data Translated
Case Number: Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
I. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year	
Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior su	Yes No.
action in this court?	in pending of within one year previously terminated
	Yes□ No□
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier m	the state of the s
terminated action in this court?	Yes No No
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights	case filed by the same individual?
	Yes No P
CIVIL: (Place ✔ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
A. Federal Question Cases:	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:
Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts	1. ☐ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	2.   Airplane Personal Injury  And the Personal Injury
3. ☐ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3.   Assault, Defamation
4. 🗆 Antitrust	4. D Marine Personal Injury
5. © Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please
7. O. Coul Broke.	specify)
7. Civil Rights	7. D Products Liability
8. ☐ Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos
9. Securities Act(s) Cases	9.   All other Diversity Cases
10. □ Social Security Review Cases  11. ★ All other Federal Question Cases 5 U.S.C. 1492	(Please specify)
(Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CERTI	FICATION
Tara L. Patterson Counsel of record do hereby certifi	
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge and to	
\$150.000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 4/29/11 lara L. Patterson	<u>88343</u>
Autorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#
NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if ther	e has been comphance with r.r.c.r. 38.
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending or vexcept as noted above.	within one year previously terminated action in this court
4/29/11 Tam 1 D. 1/2- 2	00010
DATE: Jaia L. Pattesch	<u> </u>
Attorney-at-Law	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

# CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

Chauncey m	Jase	:	CIVIL ACTION		
NCO Financial		: :	NO.		
plaintiff shall complete a G filing the complaint and se side of this form.) In the designation, that defendan	Case Management T rve a copy on all defe e event that a defend it shall, with its first parties, a Case Mana	rack Designation endants. (See§ 1 lant does not ag appearance, sub gement Track D	ection Plan of this court, couns a Form in all civil cases at the ti :03 of the plan set forth on the regree with the plaintiff regarding mit to the clerk of court and ser esignation Form specifying the	me of everse g said eve on	
SELECT ONE OF THE	FOLLOWING CA	SE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:		
a) Habeas Corpus - Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.					
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.					
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.					
d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.					
(e) Special Management - commonly referred to the court. (See reverse management cases.)	as complex and that	need special or	intense management by	( )	
(f) Standard Management - Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.					
4/29/11 Date 215-540-8888	Tura L. Pat Attorney-at 871-188-2	,	Chainely Marse Attorney for tpatterson correditlau	 <u>U.Co</u> m	
Telephone	FAX Numb	er	E-Mail Address		

(Civ. 660) 10/02

#### 1 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 CHAUNCEY MORSE, 4 Plaintiff 5 ٧. Case No.: 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 COMPLAINT П CHAUNCEY MORSE ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 12 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 13 ("Defendant"): 14 INTRODUCTION 15 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 16 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (FDCPA). 17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 18 2. Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 19 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 20 21 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 22 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 23 3. Defendant conducts business and has an office in the Commonwealth of 24 Pennsylvania, and therefore, personal jurisdiction is established. 25 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1). - l -

5. Declaratory relief is available pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

#### **PARTIES**

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in the Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15235.
- 7. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).
- 8. Also, Plaintiff is a person granted a cause of action under the FDCPA. See 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a) and Wenrich v. Cole, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18687 (E.D. Pa. Dec. 22, 2000).
- Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, Pennsylvania, 19044-2308.
- 10. Defendant is a debt collector as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and sought to collect a consumer debt from Plaintiff.
- 11. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

#### PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

- 12. The Fair Debt Collection Practices Act ("FDCPA") is a comprehensive statute, which prohibits a catalog of activities in connection with the collection of debts by third parties.

  See 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. The FDCPA imposes civil liability on any person or entity that violates its provisions, and establishes general standards of debt collector conduct, defines abuse, and provides for specific consumer rights. 15 U.S.C. § 1692k. The operative provisions of the FDCPA declare certain rights to be provided to or claimed by debtors, forbid deceitful and misleading practices, prohibit harassing and abusive tactics, and proscribe unfair or unconscionable conduct, both generally and in a specific list of disapproved practices.
- 13. In particular, the FDCPA broadly enumerates several practices considered contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The

contrary to its stated purpose, and forbids debt collectors from taking such action. The substantive heart of the FDCPA lies in three broad prohibitions. First, a "debt collector may not engage in any conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse any person in connection with the collection of a debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692d. Second, a "debt collector may not use any false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with the collection of any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e. And third, a "debt collector may not use unfair or unconscionable means to collect or attempt to collect any debt." 15 U.S.C. § 1692f. The FDCPA is designed to protect consumers from unscrupulous collectors, whether or not there exists a valid debt, broadly prohibits unfair or unconscionable collection methods, conduct which harasses, oppresses or abuses any debtor, and any false, deceptive or misleading statements in connection with the collection of a debt.

- 14. In enacting the FDCPA, the United States Congress found that "[t]here is abundant evidence of the use of abusive, deceptive, and unfair debt collection practices by many debt collectors," which "contribute to the number of personal bankruptcies, to marital instability, to the loss of jobs, and to invasions of individual privacy." 15 U.S.C. § 1692a. Congress additionally found existing laws and procedures for redressing debt collection injuries to be inadequate to protect consumers. 15 U.S.C. § 1692b.
- 15. Congress enacted the FDCPA to regulate the collection of consumer debts by debt collectors. The express purposes of the FDCPA are to "eliminate abusive debt collection practices by debt collectors, to insure that debt collectors who refrain from using abusive debt collection practices are not competitively disadvantaged, and to promote consistent State action to protect consumers against debt collection abuses." 15 U.S.C. § 1692e.

#### FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 16. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 17. The alleged debt at issue arose out of transactions, which were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 18. Beginning in or around May or June 2010 and continuing through October 6, 2010, Defendant repeatedly and continuously contacted Plaintiff on his home telephone number seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt owed.
- 19. Defendant placed repeated telephone calls to Plaintiff's home telephone, as well as leaving voice mail messages, almost every day, causing Plaintiff to receive, at times, more than two (2) collection calls a day, and at times, more than four (4) collection calls a day.
- 20. Defendant's daily repeated telephone calls to Plaintiff's home telephone caused Plaintiff to receive, on average, more than ten (10) collection calls a week and more than twenty (20) collection calls a month.
- 21. Normally Defendant would call Plaintiff and leave a message, not disclosing its identity in the message; however, Defendant's name would appear on Plaintiff's caller identification.
- 22. On one occasion, when Plaintiff spoke with Defendant's representative, Plaintiff asked what the alleged debt was for, who was the debt owed to, and what was Defendant's role with regard to the alleged debt.
- 23. Defendant's representative refused to provide Plaintiff with any of the answers to his questions, frustrating Plaintiff and making it hard for Plaintiff to determine if he even owed a debt.

]

- 24. Defendant's sole purpose in contacting Plaintiff multiple times was to harass Plaintiff.
- 25. Within five (5) days of its initial communication with Plaintiff, Defendant failed to send Plaintiff written correspondence advising him of his rights to dispute the debt and/or request verification of the debt.
- 26. To date, Plaintiff has not received any written correspondence from Defendant regarding the alleged debt, so he still does not know who the alleged debt is owed to and cannot determine whether or not he owes this alleged debt.
- 27. Defendant's actions in attempting to collect the alleged debt were harassing, abusive and highly deceptive.

#### CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 29. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir.

2002).

30. The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

# COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 31. Defendant violated the FDCPA based on the following:
  - a. Defendant violated §1692 generally;
  - Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by harassing Plaintiff in connection with the collection of an alleged debt;
  - c. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA, when it caused the Plaintiff's telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to harass, annoy or abuse Plaintiff;
  - d. Defendant violated §1692d(6) of the FDCPA, by placing telephone calls without meaningful disclosure of the caller's identity.;

24

25

- e. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA by using false, deceptive, or misleading representations or means in connection with the collection of a debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA by using false representations or deceptive means to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- g. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA by using unfair and unconscionable means with Plaintiff to collect or attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692g of the FDCPA by failing to send written notification, within five (5) days after its initial communication with Plaintiff, advising Plaintiff of his rights to dispute the debt or request verification of the debt; and
- Defendant acted in an otherwise deceptive, unfair and unconscionable manner and failed to comply with the FDCPA.
- 32. As a direct and proximate result of one or more or all of the statutory violations above, Plaintiff has suffered emotional distress.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, CHAUNCEY MORSE, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., for the following:

- Declaratory judgment that Defendant's conduct violated the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act,
- b. Statutory damages pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15
   U.S.C. § 1692k,
- c. Actual damages,
- d. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Fair Debt Collection

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692k

e. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

# **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, CHAUNCEY MORSE, demands a jury trial in this case.

DATED: 4/29/11

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.

By: Muss Paticum

Tara L. Patterson Attorney ID # 88343 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002

Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: tpatterson@creditlaw.com